

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are rejected and pending. Responsive to the Office Action mailed May 29, 2003, claims 1, 9, and 16 and paragraphs 4 and 5 of the present application have been amended. With the amendment provided above and the remarks provided below, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and a withdrawal of all objections and rejections.

Responsive to the Examiner's comments in the Office action regarding the Specification, the Specification has been amended accordingly. More specifically, paragraphs 4 and 5 of the Specification have been amended to correct spelling and grammatical errors as presented by the Examiner. No new matter has been added.

Responsive to the rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, claim 16 has been amended to now particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as the invention. More specifically, in claim 16, line 9 has been deleted.

Responsive to the rejections of claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9-11 and 16-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by JP 2000317533, the cited reference fails to teach each and every element as set forth in the invention as now claimed. A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Amended independent claims 1, 9, and 16 recite "moving the roller in a parallel direction with respect to the central axis." The cited reference JP 2000317533 fails to teach moving the roller in a parallel direction with respect to the central axis as claimed in the present application. Rather, the cited reference teaches a spinning process in which the roller rotates and runs along the work piece end periphery. *See* EPO Abstract translation of JP 2000317533 (Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement filed June 10, 2002 by Applicants). The roller is relatively rotated to a work piece 10 and the radius of rotation is gradually reduced while holding the work piece 10. *Id.* Contrary to the amended limitations claimed in the present application, the cited reference does not teach moving the roller in a parallel direction with

respect to the central axis. Thus, the rejections of claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9-11, 14, and 16-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) should be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 5, 12, and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 2000317533 in view of *Massee* U.S. Patent No. 5,775,151 (*Massee* '151). However, claim 5 is dependent on independent claim 1, claim 12 is dependent on independent claim 9, and claim 18 is dependent on independent claim 16. For the reasons set forth above, the combination does not teach or suggest all of the elements of claims 5, 12, and 18. For example, neither JP 2000317533 nor *Massee* '151 teaches moving the roller in a parallel direction with respect to the central axis as claimed in intervening amended independent claims 1, 9, and 16.

Dependent claims 13 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 2000317533 in view of *Irie* U.S. Patent No. 6,067,833 (*Irie* '833). However, claim 13 is dependent on independent claim 9 and claim 19 is dependent on independent claim 16. For the reasons set forth above, the combination does not teach or suggest all of the elements of claims 13 and 19. For example, neither JP 2000317533 nor *Irie* '833 teaches moving the roller in a parallel direction with respect to the central axis as claimed in intervening amended independent claims 9 and 16.

Claims 2-8 are dependent claims which depend generally from amended claim 1. Thus, these claims are allowable for the reasons provided above.

Claims 10-15 are dependent claims which depend generally from amended claim 9. Thus, these claims are allowable for the reasons provided above.

Claims 17-20 are dependent claims which depend generally from amended claim 16. Thus, these claims are allowable for the reasons provided above.

Moreover, other combinations of cited references fail to teach or suggest the subject matter of the amended claims and would result in improper rejections. Therefore, claims 1-20 are in a condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Applicant has calculated no fees to be presently due in connection with the filing of this Paper. However, Applicant has authorized charging of any fee deficiency to the deposit account of Applicant's assignee, Visteon Global Technologies, Inc., as indicated in the Transmittal accompanying this Statement.

Respectfully submitted,

August 28, 2003

Date



Lawrence G. Almeda (Reg. No. 46,151)

Attorney Of Record

37 C.F.R. 1.34(a)